

March 13, 1975

law regarding closed shops or right to work in other areas. However, it's a historical relationship that's existed in the State of Nebraska. I think that it has worked well in the Bar Association. I don't think that we have been besieged by lawyers, and I do not personally know of a lawyer who objects to being a member of the Bar Association, objects to paying the dues, and objects to the general purposes for which the Bar Association functions. I think that the functions of the Bar Association are legitimate and are in the public interest. Of course, they have to be funded. To a certain extent it's not unlike a lot of the other licensing situations that we find ourselves in, as far as nurses, cosmetologists, or whatever other category that we require a license to participate in that profession in the State of Nebraska. They must pay a fee to their licensing board. Their licensing board then supervises their standards, provides them with educational opportunities, and generally keeps them in the main stream of their individual professions, and attempts to upgrade the quality of those professions. The Bar Association attempts to serve that same purpose. As far as confusing Senator Chambers bill with the Cook situation it simply . . . the Cook situation simply does not enter into what Senator Chambers is attempting to do here. Senator Chambers would not change that relationship between the Supreme Court, which is the disciplinary body for lawyers. He would simply sever the Bar Association from the integrated situation in which it is, in that we all belong to that association when we practice before the bar in the State of Nebraska. The Cook situation would have developed and would reach, probably, the same conclusion whether we had an integrated bar or did not have an integrated bar. That issue, simply, isn't relevant. Senator Chambers has used the issue to propell this bill. Certainly, there is a maxim that every law student learns in law school that hard cases make bad law. Certainly the recommendation in my discussion in the last several days with probably not less than 50 attorneys regarding the recommendation of Judge Koontz to the Supreme Court regarding Mr. Cook and particularly the statement as to the requirement of truthfulness of attorneys has been unanimously rejected by every practicing member of the bar that I have discussed it with which is many. I think every lawyer of the State of Nebraska, with the exception of Judge Koontz, would find that statement at a minimum ridiculous and probably in total offensive and degrading to members of the bar. Lawyers, I think in the State of Nebraska, maintain a high standard, have and will continue to. It is not a perfect profession, but it certainly does not reach the depths to which Senator Chambers would have you believe. I think that the quality of legal education, in the State of Nebraska, is of excellent quality. I think generally the quality of professionalism within the profession is of high quality. At any rate, Senator Chambers bill would not solve any of those problems even if everything he said was true. It would simply mean that the members who practice at the bar would not have to belong to the association, would not have to pay dues thereto. The conduct and professionalism of lawyers would be the same regardless, and probably a good chance that it would be less because the Bar Association, at least in recent years, is embarked upon vigorous programs of continuing education and self-policing of standards and practice within the bar. It serves that very useful and necessary public purpose. I think that no case has been made for altering the historical position of the integrated bar in the State of Nebraska.